

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the preceding amendments and following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 5-10, 13, 14, 17, 18, 21, 22, and 25-39 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 6-9 are independent claims. Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 13, 17, 21, and 25-30 are amended, and claims 35-39 are newly added.

Examiner Interview Summary

Applicants note with appreciation that on September 8, 2010 the Examiner participated in a telephonic interview with Applicants' Representative. The claim rejections under §103 and §101 were discussed. With respect to the claim rejection under §103, Applicants Representative discussed differences between the DeMoney reference and the subject matter of claim 1. The Examiner suggested making amendments to claim 1 to clarify those differences in a manner consistent with Applicants' disclosure in order to overcome the rejection. With respect to the §101 rejection, the Examiner suggested amending the rejected claims to recite a "non-transitory computer readable medium" in order to overcome the rejection. No further agreements were reached.

Applicants note and appreciate the Examiner's suggestion during the interview to amend independent claims to clarify the location of the previously recited type information in a manner consistent with Applicants' disclosure in order to overcome the current rejection under §103. However, Applicants chose to go in a different direction with the independent claims focusing instead on the feature of mapping information including first mapping information between a presentation time and a unit of the first clip stream file and second mapping information between a presentation time and a unit of the second clip stream file. For the reasons discussed

in greater detail below, Applicants believe the currently cited art fails to teach these features as well. Further, Applicants note, based on the Examiner's suggestion to clarify the description of the recited type information in a manner consistent with Applicants' disclosure, dependent claims 5, 13, 17, 21 and 25 have each been amended to include such a description of the type information.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2, 5-10, 13-14, 17-18, 21-22, 25, and 31-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Publication No. 2004/0057700 to Okada ("Okada") in view of US Patent Publication No. 2002/0145702 to Kato ("Kato") and further in view of US Patent Publication No. 2002/0176695 to Sawabe ("Sawabe"), US Patent No. 6,064,379 to DeMoney ("DeMoney") and US Patent Publication No. 2005/0066352 to Herley ("Herley"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons detailed below.

Applicants respectfully submit claim 1 has been amended and now recites: "wherein the database area includes first mapping information between a presentation time and a unit of the first clip stream file and second mapping information between a presentation time and a unit of the second clip stream file, and the first mapping information includes at least one entry point, every still image in the first clip stream file being pointed to by an entry point". Applicants respectfully submit on page 12 of the current Office Action, the Examiner indicated that Okada, Kato, Sawabe, DeMoney and Herley failed to teach the first and second mapping information. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit, Okada, Kato, Sawabe, DeMoney and Herley fail to teach of the limitations of claim 1, as amended. Consequently, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to amended claim 1 as is required to support a rejection under §103.

Applicants note in rejecting claim 26, the Examiner asserts that Saeki (US 2001/0043790) teaches “first mapping information between a presentation time and a unit of the first clip stream file” and “second mapping information between a presentation time and a unit of the second clip stream file”. Accordingly, Saeki will now be discussed below.

Applicants respectfully submit, with respect to teaching the first and second mapping information discussed above, the Examiner references portions of Saeki including, FIGS 6, 9, 7A and 7B, as well as column 12, lines 1-34 and column 15, line 29 to column 16, line 4. However, as an initial matter, it is not clear what portions of Saeki the Examiner is referring to. For example, Saeki does not include FIGS. 7A or 7B. Saeki does include a FIG.7, but FIG. 7 of Saeki does not disclose mapping information. Additionally, the version of Saeki cited by the Examiner is a US patent publication which does not include column numbers or line numbers. Accordingly, it is not clear what portions of the text of Saeki the Examiner intends to cite. Further, Applicants respectfully submit Saeki does not teach “the database area includes first mapping information between a presentation time and a unit of the first clip stream file and second mapping information between a presentation time and a unit of the second clip stream file” where the first clip stream file includes video data representing at least one still image and the second clip stream file includes audio data as the limitations of claim 1 require. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit the combination of Okada, Kato, Sawabe, DeMoney, Herley and Saeki likewise fails to teach or render obvious the limitations of claim 1.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to claim 1 or any claims depending from claim 1 as is required to support a rejection under §103.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit claims 6-9 have been amended and include limitations similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to any of claims 6-9 or any claims depending from any of claims 6-9 as is required to support a rejection under §103.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 1-2, 5-10, 13-14, 17-18, 21-22, 25, and 31-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

Claims 26-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okada in view of Kato and further in view of Sawabe, DeMoney, Herley, and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0043790 to Saeki ("Saeki"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons detailed below.

The deficiencies of Sawabe, DeMoney, Herley and Saeki are discussed above and are relevant here because claims 26-30 depend from claims 1 and 6-9. For at least the reasons discussed above, none of Sawabe, DeMoney, Herley and Saeki, alone or in combination, teach or render obvious the limitations of any of claims 1 and 6-9. Accordingly, none of Sawabe, DeMoney, Herley and Saeki, alone or in combination, teach or render obvious each of the limitations of any of claims 26-30. Consequently, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to any of claims 26-30 as is required to support a rejection under §103.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 26-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1, 2, 5, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons detailed below.

The Examiner asserts claims 1, 2, 5 and 26 may be interpreted as being directed to signals, and thus, claims 1, 2, 5 and 26 are directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully submit claims 1, 2, 5 and 26 have each been amended and now recite a “non-transitory computer readable medium”. Applicants respectfully submit claims 1, 2, 5 and 26 are not directed to signals and are directed to statutory subject matter under §101.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 1, 2, 5, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §101 be withdrawn.

New Claims

Claims 35-39 are newly added and include no new matter. Claims 35-39 depend from claims 1 and 6-9. For the reasons discussed above, Applicants believe claims 1 and 6-9 to be allowable over the presently cited art. Accordingly, Applicants believe claims 35-39 to be allowable over the presently cited art.

<Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank>

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks and amendments, the Applicants respectfully submit that each of the pending objections and rejections has been addressed and overcome, placing the present application in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.


Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By



JHA Reg. No. 64,571
Gary D. Yacura, Reg. No. 35,416

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

GDY/JHA:eaf

1021306.1